For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL D. PIERCE,

No. C 08-04446 SBA (PR)

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

DIRECTOR OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATIONS, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff requests the appointment of counsel to represent him in this action.

There is no constitutional right to counsel in a civil case unless an indigent litigant may lose his physical liberty if he loses the litigation. See Lassiter v. Dep't of Soc. Servs., 452 U.S. 18, 25 (1981); Rand v. Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997) (no constitutional right to counsel in § 1983 action), withdrawn in part on other grounds on reh'g en banc, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc). The court may ask counsel to represent an indigent litigant under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 only in "exceptional circumstances," the determination of which requires an evaluation of both (1) the likelihood of success on the merits, and (2) the ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. See id. at 1525; Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986). Both of these factors must be viewed together before reaching a decision on a request for counsel under § 1915. See id.

For the Northern District of California **United States District Court**

The Court is unable to assess at this time whether exceptional circumstances exist which
would warrant seeking volunteer counsel to accept a <u>pro bono</u> appointment. The proceedings are at
an early stage and it is premature for the Court to determine Plaintiff's likelihood of success on the
merits. Moreover, Plaintiff has been able to articulate his claims adequately <u>pro se</u> in light of the
complexity of the issues involved. See Agyeman v. Corrs. Corp. of Am., 390 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th
Cir. 2004). Accordingly, the request for appointment of counsel at this time is DENIED. This does
not mean, however, that the Court will not consider appointment of counsel at a later juncture in the
proceedings, that is, after Defendants have filed their dispositive motion and the Court has a better
understanding of the procedural and substantive matters at issue. Therefore, Plaintiff may file a
renewed motion for the appointment of counsel after Defendants' dispositive motion has been filed.
If the Court decides that appointment of counsel is warranted at that time, then it can seek volunteer
counsel to agree to represent Plaintiff pro bono.

This Order terminates Docket no. 3.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 10/27/08

SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG United States District Judge

28

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	MICHAEL D. PIERCE,
4	Case Number: CV08-04446 SBA Plaintiff,
5	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE v.
6	DIRECTOR OF CORRECTIONS et al,
7	Defendant.
8	
9	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
11	That on October 28, 2008, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said
12	\parallel -
13	Tocated in the Clerk's office.
14	
15	Michael D. Pierce CDCR #P-31729
16	CDCR - Corcoran P.O. Box 5242
17	Corcoran, CA 93212
18	Dated: October 28, 2008 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
19	By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	